

Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board

It is the mission of the Teaching and School Administration Professional Standards Advisory Board to promote excellence in the education profession and develop and review professional standards to ensure quality preparation and continued professional growth experiences.

Kansas State Department of Education

OFFICIAL MINUTES

February 2, 2015, 10:00 a.m.

Kansas State Department of Education, 900 SW Jackson Street, Room 102, Topeka, KS

1. Call meeting to order

Scott Myers welcomed everyone. The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Deb Mercer, Chair.

2. Roll call

Attending: Adam Bancroft, Tammy Bartels, Kathryn Beougher, Amy Compton, Monte Couchman, Paul Erickson, Jonathan Goering, Gwen Landever, Deb Mercer, Denise O'Dea, Michele Perez, Rudy Perez, Kate Thompson

Absent: Shelley Addis, Nick Compagnone, Fred Patton, Kathy Wagoner, Mike Wilson

KSDE: Scott Myers, Susan Helbert, Diana Stephan, TJ Boeckman, Catherine Chmidling

KSBE: Jim Porter

Guests: Cory Murphy, Janet Cook, Jessica Stern, with Educational Testing Service (ETS)

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: It was M/S (R. Perez/Goering) to approve the agenda with the following additions. Motion carried.

Under New Business added new item: *e. Resignation of Standards Board member*

4. Approval of Minutes of November 24, 2014

Motion: It was M/S (O'Dea/M. Perez) to approve the minutes of November 24, 2014. Motion carried.

5. Open Forum

No one was available to speak at the open forum at 10:10am.

6. Continuing Business

Ethics Modules/Work: ETS

Scott introduced staff with Educational Testing Service. A video highlighting training modules designed for the Georgia Department of Education was shown. Several of the modules have an end of module test and are taken online. There is no national cut score for these tests. A series of training modules and assessments that are self-guided and authentic scenarios can be customized for Kansas. Questions to think about: Where does this fit in Kansas? Is this a mentor program, induction, or preservice? Is this for both teachers and leaders? What resources for Kansas?

Questions from Professional Standards Board (PSB) members with response from ETS followed.

Q: How many different trailers are there?

A: There are four video scenarios for risk. There is one branch for many different paths. Hundreds of topics are covered.

Q: How extensive is it for a five-year teacher? What would the module look like?

A: The overall format is the same, but different scenarios. ETS is still researching.

Q: How intense is the training; monthly newsletters or once a year training? Are there different scenarios for different levels of teachers?

A: Not the same for all levels. Social media and texting would not be at all levels. ETS is working on creating more scenarios. Possibly create a library that a candidate could choose from.

Q: Has there been any impact in Georgia yet?

A: It's been just three months, but ETS research group will look at. There is an increase in reporting in first year.

Q: Are schools given ethical profiles?

A: That would go too far with this product to give ethical profiles.

Q: Can individual profiles be provided, receiving a score based on a set of scenarios?

A: The training by ETS is decided by the individual state. There is only feedback on the modules with questions that are cut and dried. Touch questions and activities have feedback.

Other comments :

- Ethics training is not a high priority in my district. Could this professional learning be tied to relicensing?
- How much time do you spend on this with new teachers?
- Could this be embedded in higher education teacher program and then have a refresher course after teaching in the classroom?
- Probably would not use this as an entry into higher education, but would be a great resource for training. Would not prevent someone from getting into a program. ETS responded that when used at entry, will be more as awareness module.
- Could be used with a formal mentor program?
- What about all the classified staff? Should they have exposure to this?
- Should school board members get the training? ETS responded that they are researching that.

ETS stated that the price per candidate is \$55. However, if Kansas is one of first five states to adopt, then the price will drop to \$50 per candidate. ETS clarified that a candidate has access to all through module 7 until finished, but for ongoing professional development, would not have access to once the candidate finished.

Process of reviewing current licensure tests: ETS

Susan introduced Cory Murphy with ETS. Cory shared a power point which gave an overview of licensure/certification testing, process state's use to adopt tests and cut scores, and the test review process to consider different test options. Cory will provide a copy of the power point for Susan. Susan

stated that the timing of this information is good because of the program standards review timeline that will result in new program standards for all endorsement/licensure areas.

Recessed briefly at 11:39am to walk to room 509 for lunch.

The agenda resumed with item III. C. and E, under New Business, during lunch.

7. New Business

Candidate work sample and PSB representative

Scott shared that a subcommittee comprised of Unit Heads from three public higher education institutions and three from private higher education institutions as well as a representative from the PSB (Paul Erickson) will meet on February 13 to review the purpose and use of the candidate work sample in Kansas. The four options are 1) to do nothing, 2) use for program completion, 3) use as a key assessment for moving forward, or 4) use as a licensure requirement. The intent is to unpack to fuel further conversation at the Unit Head meeting on March 6.

Resignation of Standards Board member

Fred Patton, representing local board of education members, has submitted his resignation effective immediately. The board accepted his resignation with the following motion.

Motion: It was M/S (O'Dea/M. Perez) to accept the resignation of Fred Patton effective immediately. Motion carried.

The agenda moved back to Continuing Business

8. Continuing Business

Program Standards - (handouts)

- Approved –The web address for comments on the approved standards will be sent to all PSB members. Catherine handed out copies of the following documents:
 - Crosswalk: Previous versus New Professional Education Standards
 - Crosswalk: Previous versus New Professional School Counselor Standards
 - Crosswalk: Previous versus New Agricultural Education Standards
- Next Areas -The next set of standards are in the areas of Leadership (building and district), Early Childhood Unified, and Low-incidence and High-incidence Special Education. Reviewers will include higher education staff, building and district school administrators, teachers, and parents. The goal is to send three to four revised standards quarterly to the State Board for approval.

A vote was taken via e-mail. The following message was sent to PSB members from Scott Myers on February 4 and the following members voted to approve the Leadership (building and district), Early Childhood Unified, and Low-incidence and High-incidence Special Education standards: Adam Bancroft, Monte Couchman, Paul Erickson, Jonathan Goering, Gwen Landever, Deb Mercer, Denise O'Dea, Michele Perez, Kate Thompson.

Dear Standards Board Members,

*We inadvertently failed to have you examine and approve the next set of program standards, including **Leadership (building and district), Early Childhood Unified, and Low-incidence and High-incidence Special Education**. We need PSB approval before they may be sent on to the SBoE for final approval. These standards are all in the Public Comment phase, so, of course, if there are any major changes we would bring them back to your attention.*

Please take a look at the attached standards and then send your electronic vote to Dr. Deb Mercer at dmercerc@ksu.edu

The agenda moved to Goals Update

9. Goals Update

Professional Learning Taskforce: BloomBoard update
Scott reported that the conversation is continuing.

The agenda moved to Standing Committee Reports

10. Standing Committee Reports

Policies and Procedures Committee

Catherine reported that the committee has not met this quarter. An ad hoc committee has been working on revising the program template. A copy of the program template draft document was given to PSB members. Following the completion of the revision to the program template, the Policies and Procedures Committee will review and then forward their recommendation to the Standards Board.

Following a short break from 12:20-12:30, the meeting resumed in room 102.

The agenda moved back to Continuing Business

11. Continuing Business

Mentor guidelines and process of approval of programs – (handout)

Susan shared a document that included the mentor regulatory requirements under 91-1-203 (b)(1), (2), (3) with new language (5) added as well as the Guidelines and a document that includes the KSDE explanation of the guidelines. Approved programs must be implemented for the 2015-16 school year. Dissemination of information to all districts is a three phase process: two messages sent this spring with an explanation and information, including a copy of the *Kansas Model Mentor and Induction Program Guidelines for New Teachers and School Specialists*; *Kansas Model Mentor and Induction Program Guidelines for New Leaders*. The final message to the districts will be sent in late March or April and will include a final, detailed Guidance Document, and an electronic report for districts to submit their programs for approval. After reviewing the handouts with PSB members, Susan asked members for input. Scott indicated that the vetting process will be similar to the teacher leader evaluation work.

Discussion/comments:

What companies offer a mentor program?

Some of the district programs already meet these guidelines.

Would be required at district level?

The more places we identify, the better, i.e., principals, superintendents.

Even if a district does not mentor, would still need to notify KSDE.

Sometimes hires are at mid-year.

What does the submission process look like? Response from Susan: would be a series of questions, i.e., second year plan of mentor criteria, short template.

Do we have to pay the mentor? Responses from PSB members indicated that the mentor should be paid.

Math endorsement feedback

A math survey regarding adding an endorsement was sent to a group of math teachers as recommended by the KSDE math consultant, Melissa Fast. Thirteen responses were received.

- Three of the responses said do not do it.
- Six said great idea, about time.
- Two responses questioned if this will really help or restrict.
- Two responses said would be another program review.

Currently many of the Kansas IHEs do not offer middle level programs. This could be an area for exploration or opportunity. PSB members were asked for comments.

Discussion/comments:

1. There are many higher level math classes. Anything above calculus III would be high.
2. KSDE currently licenses middle level math.
3. Larger districts such as Olathe and Wichita do not seem to have a problem finding math teachers, but the rural districts may have trouble finding math teachers.
4. Susan shared that the Educator Data Collection System (EDCS) assignments built in to the vacancy report by next year will give us accurate data.
5. Perhaps accurate data is needed before we know the impact.

12. New Business

Bilingual endorsement

Scott stated that several districts are looking for candidates that are not just bilingual, but have completed core subjects in English and Spanish, truly an immersion of both languages.

Also requested from districts is an endorsement for technology specialist, a person who is an educator and also knows the hardware. Susan noted that other states do offer specialized endorsements.

Gwen noted that the program at University of St Mary does not teach hardware for the technology director, only teaches pedagogy.

Amy noted that a business person teaching technology in her district is very good at teaching the technology even though he does not have the teacher training.

Denise noted that the needs of the district and how many hours are needed for a technology director are more than a teacher works.

What are the district needs?

How would districts pay for all those hours?

Another licensure area that PSB members were asked to think about is director of special education.

Susan noted the current requirements for a special education director. She asked if we should we get feedback from the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC). Should we contact other states for patterns? Other comments: Are we missing some good people because of the district requirement? SEAC will also be contacted.

Appointment to the Evaluation Review Committee

Motion: It was M/S (O'Dea/Goering) to approve the appointment of Darlene Palmer to the Evaluation Review Committee representing secondary classroom teachers. Mrs. Palmer will be appointed to a partial term to run from February 2, 2015 through June 30, 2015, due to a resignation. Motion carried.

13. Goals Update

Bylaws: Articles I, II, III - (handout)

Susan reported that she had reviewed the proposed changes with KSDE Legal staff. The proposed changes include removing the Mission from within the by-laws. No changes were proposed for the Objectives.

Proposed changes to the Article II, Membership, include adding the word *licensed* listed under 1.1)1). She noted that there is old language under 1.b) 4) and 6) but cannot change as this is in statute. Another proposed change is under Article II, 2. Nominations - instead of naming specific organizations to obtain nominations, the recommendation is to not list specific organizations, but to list organizations such as Kansas National Education Association (KNEA), school leadership organizations such as United School Administrators (USA) and drilling down to superintendents, special education administrators and elementary and secondary groups such as Kansas Association of Elementary School Principals (KAESP) and Kansas Association of Secondary School Principals (KASSP). Article II, 3. Appointments – no changes recommended. Article II, 4. Vacancies – recommend changes to second paragraph two as set out below in italics:

By a 2/3 vote of the voting membership, the Professional Standards Board may recommend to the State Board of Education a member for removal for excessive absences. *Prior to the vote on recommendation, the member shall be given reasonable notice and hearing in accordance with the provisions of the Kansas administrative procedures act. “Excessive absences” is defined as three absences from regularly scheduled meetings in any year or four absences from regularly scheduled meetings during an appointed term. When a member has missed two meetings within any year, or three meetings during their appointed term, the chairperson of the Professional Standards Board shall immediately notify the member in writing that they may be recommended for removal from the Board if one additional absence occurs. The written notice shall include a statement requesting voluntary resignation from the Board if the member is unable to fulfill their commitment for the remainder of their appointed term.*

III.5. Reimbursement of Expenses – no changes

Article III, Organization, 3 – Changed Certification and Teacher Education to *Teacher Licensure and Accreditation*.

Article III, Organization, 4. B) deleted certain wording as follows: All meetings of the Professional Standards Board shall be conducted in ~~the office of the Commissioner of Education or at some other~~ a place designated by the Executive Committee of the Professional Standards Board.

The remaining by-laws will continue to be reviewed by the subcommittee. Those edits will be brought to the PSB April meeting for a vote of approval.

Review current exams:

ETS information provided by Cory Murphy during the meeting related to this goal.

Code of Conduct: ETS and local efforts –(handout)

Diana Stephan provided a brief overview of the Kansas Code of Conduct as well as information on the National model code. The National Association of Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) has a draft *Model Code of Ethics for Educators* available for comment from February 2-March 2, 2015, on their website www.NASDTEC.net

14. Standing Committee Reports

- Executive Committee – Deb reported that the Executive Committee met prior to the full meeting. One item was added to the agenda as announced under item #3 approval of agenda. Paul Erickson was selected as the PSB representative to serve on the subcommittee working on the KPTP candidate work sample.
- State Board of Education Report – Jim Porter reported that he is new member of the State Board of Education. He shared that SB67 has been introduced in the Senate. The bill will eliminate our ability to use our standards. He noted that ETS has been working on emergency safety intervention. Also noted was Incoming Commissioner Randy Watson’s listening tour across the state. The tour will take place in Mr. Porter’s state board district on February 4 and 5. Attendance is encouraged for everyone as the meetings are scheduled during the day and also in the evening.
- TLA Leadership Report – Scott reported that a presentation regarding the K-12 accreditation system will be given at the February State Board of Education meeting. The KSDE Accreditation Advisory Council will be meeting February 9, 2015 at KSDE. Scott shared that a more streamlined version of the Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP) will be launched soon. Susan reported that the new fingerprint requirement for veteran teachers is going well. She noted that fingerprints should not be sent in ahead of the renewal application. The new online licensure applications are on hold until some issues can be cleared up with the on-line authenticated application system. The new out of state application will be paper with the ability to have supporting documents submitted electronically.
- Regulations Committee – Susan stated that the committee had not met recently. Future work will involve reviewing the Professional Development Taskforce recommendations, professional learning and candidate work sample, and the transition to Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).
- Evaluation Review Committee – Catherine reported that the committee met on January 29 and reviewed two institutions and 26 programs. The face to face meetings are helpful.
- Licensure Review Committee – Susan reported that the number of cases is down due to new regulations. The Licensure Review Committee processes have been updated and will be more efficient and simple for candidates as well as the committee. The goal is to create an online process.
- Policies and Procedures Committee – Catherine reported that no meetings have been scheduled. An ad hoc committee is working on the program template revision. The ad hoc committee met on October 10 and plans to meet once more before sending their recommendations to the Policies and Procedures Committee.

15. Agenda items for next meeting

Agenda items can be sent to Scott Myers: smyers@ksde.org

16. Adjournment

Motion: It was M/S (O’Dea/Goering) to adjourn. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 1:51pm.

17. Next meeting date: Monday, April 13, 2015, KSDE Room 102, LSOB, 900 SW Jackson St, Topeka.